

REMARKS

This Amendment is filed concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination. Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 18-20 have been amended. It is respectfully submitted that this Response is fully responsive to the Office Action dated January 21, 2010

35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph, Rejection:

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9 , 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present application neither has any descriptions for a signal for waking up nor any descriptions for data for generating the signal. This complies with the feature of the claims "wherein the access request does not include a signal to be intended for waking up or sleeping the information processor by the external apparatus, and data for generating the signal."

It is unambiguously and undoubtedly clear to a skilled person in the art from the context

of the specification that the access request in the present invention does not include a signal to be intended for waking up or sleeping the information processor by the external apparatus, and data for generating the signal.

Accordingly, the amended claims, 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 18-20, contain subject matter which was described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor at the time the application was filed had possession of the claimed invention. Therefore, the claims 1, 3-4, 6-7, 9-10, 12-13, 15-16 and 18-20 comply with the written description requirement. Further, claims 2, 5, 8, 11, 14 and 17 meet the requirements under 35U.S.C 112, first paragraph, for the same reasons as their respective base claims by virtue of their dependency therefrom. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

As to the Merits:

As to the merits of this case, the Examiner sets forth the following rejections:

claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art (“AP”) in view of Brabenac; and

claims 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art (“AP”) in view of Brabenac and Dea.

Each of these rejections is respectfully traversed.

However, amended claims 1-20 are novel and inventive and therefore patentable over AP

in view of Brabenac (and Dea) for the following reasons.

The present invention as recited in amended claim 1 provides a gateway card that is connected to an information processor and that receives and transmits data between different networks.

The gateway card comprises an access accepting unit that accepts an access request from an apparatus connected to one of networks, and an access control unit that leads the apparatus to make access to an external apparatus connected to another one of networks and in a state that the operation of the information processor is maintained in a power-saving operation mode, when the access request is accepted in a state that the operation of the information processor is in a power-saving operation mode and also when the access request corresponds to the access to the external apparatus, and the access control unit carries out a control to adjust a difference between communication protocols of said one of the networks and said another one of the networks as recited in the amended claim 1.

The gateway card is characterized in that the access request does not include a signal to be intended for waking up or sleeping the information processor by the external apparatus, and data for generating the signal as recited in amended claim 1.

Both AP and Brabenac fail to teach or suggest the feature that the access request does

not include a signal to be intended for waking up or sleeping the information processor by the external apparatus and data for generating the signal as recited in amended claim 1.

Specifically, Brabenac describes a method at port filter in paragraphs 0046 and 0047, and Fig. 5 as follows: " ... Control then continues to block 520 where port filter 276 determines whether the port number in the received packet matches the port number assigned to an application executing on host computer 110. ... If the determination at block 520 is true, then control continues to block 540 where port filter 276 sends a wake-up message to host computer 110."

That is, the received packet (corresponding to "the access request" in the amended claim 1) includes the wake-up message (corresponding to "a signal to be intended for waking up or sleeping the information processor by the external apparatus" in the amended claim 1) or the port number (corresponding to "data for generating the signal" in the amended claim 1).

Thus, the amended claim 1 is novel and inventive and therefore patentable over AP in view of Brabenac. The amended claims 3-4, 6-7, 9-10, 12-13, 15-16 and 18-20 are novel and inventive and therefore patentable over AP in view of Brabenac for the same reasons as the amended claim 1. Specifically, with regard to claims 19 and 20, it is submitted that the Dea reference fails to cure the above-noted drawbacks and deficiencies of AP in view of Brabenac. Further, the remaining claims are novel and inventive and therefore patentable over AP in view of Brabenac for at least the same reasons as respective amended independent claims by virtue of their respective dependency therefrom.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicant submits that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicant requests such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

/THOMAS E. BROWN/
Thomas E. Brown
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,450
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

TEB/nrp